

I am upset at Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary just before the November 2004 election. It is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. It seems as though Sinclair is using public airways for their own interest. Isn't it better to have news of local interest and real substance that really serve our communities than something produced by the large conglomerate that serves ITS needs, not ours.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.